

REMARKS

Claims 1, 6 - 10, 15 - 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Iyengar et al (U.S. 6,018,627).

With regard to Claims 1, 10, and 19, Iyengar describes in column 4, lines 28 - 31, that all of the entities and objects associated with the application under development, as well as relationships between these entities and objects, are stored in the repository 20. Clearly this recitation deals with a single application--that is, the application under development. It does not describe or suggest entity and object relationship data between applications. The example given by Iyengar in his following sentence in column 4, lines 31 - 33, likewise clearly describes a single application.

Iyengar also describes in column 3, lines 60 - 63, legacy items which may include pre-existing applications. The discovered legacy items may then be transformed into business or object models, or into reusable components. Although Iyengar uses the plural word "applications," there is no description or suggestion that the business or object models resulting from transforming the legacy items are common between individual applications, i.e., span a plurality of applications as required by Applicants' independent Claims 1, 10, and 19. Iyengar merely states that the legacy items may be transformed into business or object models. Without further description of developing business rules spanning a plurality of applications or the advantages thereof, Iyengar fails to anticipate Applicants' invention of Claims 1, 10, and 19. These Claims are therefore allowable over Iyengar and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) is respectfully requested.

All of the remaining claims are dependent directly or indirectly on these allowable claims and are therefore also allowable.

Claims 2 - 5, 11 - 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Iyengar in view of Souder et al (U.S. 6,724,556). However, this rejection is moot in view of the arguments above.

The Application is deemed in condition for allowance and such action by the Examiner is urged. Should differences remain, however, which do not place one/more of the remaining claims in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to phone the undersigned at the number provided below for the purpose of providing constructive assistance and suggestions in accordance with M.P.E.P. Sections 707, 707.07(d) and 707.07(j) in order that allowable claims can be presented, thereby placing the application in condition for allowance without further proceedings being necessary.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 03/02/05

By: John Pivnichny  
John R. Pivnichny  
Reg. No. 43,001

Telephone: (607)429-4358  
Fax: (607)429-4119